Jun 25th, 12:00 AM

Exploring the Pop-up Shop for Co-design Research

Anja Overdiek
The Hague University of Applied Sciences

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dl.designresearchsociety.org/drs-conference-papers>

Citation

Overdiek, A. (2018) Exploring the Pop-up Shop for Co-design Research, in Storni, C., Leahy, K., McMahon, M., Lloyd, P. and Bohemia, E. (eds.), *Design as a catalyst for change - DRS International Conference 2018*, 25-28 June, Limerick, Ireland. <https://doi.org/10.21606/drs.2018.457>

This Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Conference Proceedings at DRS Digital Library. It has been accepted for inclusion in DRS Biennial Conference Series by an authorized administrator of DRS Digital Library. For more information, please contact DL@designresearchsociety.org.

Exploring the Pop-up Shop for Co-design Research

OVERDIEK Anja

The Hague University of Applied Sciences
A.Overdiek@hhs.nl
doi: 10.21606/drs.2018.457

Temporary physical spaces are increasingly used as catalyst to engage consumers and users in co-design activities. Whilst there are published insights into the design and facilitation of these spaces, a systematic view on their research opportunities and design requirements is still missing. This paper takes a first exploration into the employment of physical pop-up shops for user and stakeholder engagement. It analyses theory from marketing and human geography from a design research perspective to formulate design requirements for pop-up shops with the goal of engagement and co-design. It also proposes to categorize pop-up shop research as experience prototyping for the near future, thus firmly placing it into the framework of the design research landscape. To illustrate this proposition, it uses data from three cases of an iterative pop-up shop research project. Finally, it discusses conclusions about the requirements and opportunities for co-design in pop-up shop research.

co-design, user engagement, pop-up shop, experience prototyping

1 Introduction

Both interaction design and open innovation design have made explorations into the use of temporary spatial interventions (Maxwell, Woods & Prior, 2013; Teal & French, 2016; French, Teal & Raman, 2016). The goal of these interventions with names like ‘designed engagement places’, ‘pop-up environments’ or ‘experience labs’ is to create engaging experience platforms for users and stakeholders to co-design. For the purpose of this paper, co-design is defined as “designers and non-designers working together using making as a way to make sense of the future” (Sanders & Stappers, 2014: 5). Pop-up spaces for co-design are meant to be collaborative places, where design researchers, users and design artefacts make meaningful connections. Innovation is an important goal of these spatial interventions.

Designed Engagement aims to not only engage people in dialogue to collaboratively explore ideas and differences in views, but to engage them in creative exploration of new ways of doing things to work towards preferable futures. (Teal & French, 2016: 6)

Engagement platforms that include physical space, as opposed to ‘immersive labs’ that use virtual reality (VR) simulation (Martinez, Isaacs, Fernandez-Gutierrez, Gilmour & Scott-Brown, 2016) often draw on the so called interstitiality. Temporary spaces appear and disappear within more stable environments and are perceived as physical in-between places. As such, they can disrupt spatial and

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

temporal routines and offer new alternatives for users (Harris, 2015: 597). Artist-led spaces like 'happenstance' are ways of "activating the space such that people who inhabited it worked towards a particular goal outside of their normal routine" (Maxwell, Woods & Prior, 2013: 202).

Retail pop-up shops are another example of spaces for co-design. Pop-up shops are temporary and highly experiential physical spaces that have been predominantly used by brands for marketing goals. However, the fact that commercial stakeholders always have an agenda they impose on consumers/users has led design researcher to neglect the knowledge created by pop-up retailing literature. Meanwhile the willingness of consumers to collaborate is increasing as they seek "consumptive/ creative balance" (Sanders & Stappers, 2008) and opportunities to mix passive consumption with the choice to engage in creative experiences.

In practice, the problem that users who are currently motivated to co-design are mostly highly involved and knowledgeable users that differ significantly from the majority of consumers (Hoyer, Chandy, Dorotic, Krafft & Singh, 2010: 289), might be tackled by pop-up shop research. Moreover, diverse stakeholders who do not have the mind set (yet) to engage in more focussed co-design activities, could be engaged. In order to attract broader and more diverse groups of users and stakeholders into co-creating products and services at different stages of the design process, entire pop-up shop concepts or certain properties could be utilized.

Aiming at exploring the pop-up shop for co-design research, this paper will first develop an operational definition of the pop-up shop by analyzing literature from marketing and human geography about successful pop-up shop properties. It will further develop this definition from the perspective of experience prototyping and user engagement and place the resulting research approach into the landscape of co-design (Sanders & Stappers, 2014). It will then delve deeper into putting this theory into practice, illustrating the approach using data from a pop-up shop research project which included three iterations. The goal of this exploration is to provide a systematic view on the co-design opportunities of pop-up shop research and its related design requirements.

2 Theory and methodology

2.1 Methodology choices

The leading question of this paper is: What is a pop-up shop research approach and how does it fit into the broader landscape of design research?

This study champions a performative social sciences methodology: Collaborative practices are created and recreated daily within distinctive spatial contexts. The designer, her students and other network partners are human actors interacting with the pop-up itself as a "nonhuman actor" (Latour, 1994) to unfold a presence. From this grounded-in-action perspective, reality is the outcome of a joint mediation between the "built-in properties" (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2004: 18) of objects and the objectives of human subjects. This methodology matches well with

... 'constructive design research', which refers to design research in which construction – be it product, system, space or media – takes center place and becomes the key means in constructing knowledge. (Koskinen, Zimmerman, Binder, Redstrom & Wensveen, 2011: 5)

Taking into consideration these methodological choices, the first sub-question must be: What are the relevant design properties of the pop-up shop that fit the objective of co-design, translated into the language of existing concepts in co-design?

The resulting proposition of a pop-up shop research approach then needs to be contextualised using a model of the broader design research landscape. The model developed by Sanders and Stappers (2014) was chosen. This model knows several categories which fit well with findings of the first sub-question, including the intent of engagement, the time horizon in the near future (e.g. next generation) and the mindset of co-design (a continuum between 'designing for users' and 'designing with users').

Once defined and contextualized theoretically, the pop-up shop approach needs to be fleshed out in practice. How is pop-up shop research rolled out? Which methods are best used to collect data?

Pop-up environments are by definition limited in time, and therefore require close monitoring and responsive facilitation to ensure the most effective use of resources, however these intensive, condensed environments or specific events within larger pop-ups can be directly instigated by researchers, providing the opportunity to embed data gathering and a focus on thematic topics of interest into the space from the outset. (Maxwell, Woods & Prior, 2013: 201)

With the complexity of pop-up research in mind, the final sub-question of this paper is about the opportunities and challenges of pop-up shop research. To illustrate the theoretical proposition and explore this last question, the data of a pop-up shop research project with three iterations will be used. The different methods of data gathering will be reported in the description of each iteration.

2.2 Design properties of successful pop-up shops

What are the relevant design properties of the pop-up shop for the objectives of co-design?

Literature on pop-up shops currently revolves around pop-up retailing. Warnaby, Kharakhorkina, Shi & Corniani (2015: 303) define pop-up retailing as “an experientially orientated consumer-brand interaction, taking place within a particular, albeit temporary, ‘territory’”. They identify three distinguishing characteristics of pop-up retailing from existing literature: (1) a highly experiential in-shop environment; (2) a focus on promoting a brand or product line; and (3) availability for a limited period of time, with this essential ephemerality aiming to create a sense of urgency, to stimulate purchase or other actions. However, Warnaby et al. (2015) similar to most other marketing scholars (De Lassus & Freire, 2014; Gursch & Gursch, 2014; Haas and Schmidt, 2016; Kastner, 2015; Klein, Falk, Esch & Gloukhovtsev, 2016; Pomodoro, 2013; Russo Spena, Caridà, Colurcio & Melia, 2012; Surchi, 2011), focus on the marketing objectives of global brands: to promote brand/product lines in ‘brand pantheons’, to test new markets and to sell seasonal or limited editions of product. Interestingly, human geography scholars (Andres, 2013; Colomb 2012; Ferreri, 2015; Ferreri, 2016; Finan, 2015; Harris, 2015) mostly take the perspective of small business and cultural start-ups on temporary spaces. These authors describe the pop-up shop as a community shop catering to alternative lifestyles (Ferreri 2015; Ziehl & Osswald, 2015) which they call the ‘tribal shop’. It is the so-called placemaking that is the result of a successful pop-up spacing which revalues vacant retail space. This is particularly successful when cultural or small business initiatives work closely together with local residents. The result is a reevaluation of the space after the temporary experience, a new recalled identity of place (Finan, 2015; Moore-Cherry, 2017).

The temporary use of vacant or derelict spaces by a pop-up shop is not new. Temporary shops, galleries and restaurants emerged in the U.S. at the turn of the new millennium. In Europe, pop-up shops ‘officially’ appeared some thirteen years ago, when in 2004 the high fashion label ‘Comme des Garçons’ opened a temporary guerilla shop furnished in an abandoned bookshop in Berlin, Germany (Alexander & Bain, 2016). Since then, unusual and unique locations have been associated with pop-up retailing. Temporary shops predominantly pop up in upcoming urban environments all over the world, albeit in highest frequency in global cities.

There is strong consensus in pop-up research that millennials, with their hedonic and experiential motivations, are the demographic group which feels most attracted to temporary spaces (see for an overview Taube & Warnaby, 2017: 389). This diverse group of people born between 1980 and 2000 are more extraverted and leisure-values oriented than earlier generations (Twenge & Campbell, 2012). Raised in a time of accelerated technology use and globalization, they are well-informed consumers using online information, blogs and peer reviews for product orientation. Offline and embodied, they are predominantly looking for experiences and the identification with products and their producers (De Lassus & Freire, 2014; Gursch & Gursch, 2014). They are “always on the move, are driven by the wish to freely live temporary and exciting experiences” (Pomodoro, 2013: 342). The pop-up shop, which typically lasts several days to several months and often has a restricted or

exclusive product range satisfies these needs (Alexander & Bain, 2016; Haas & Schmidt, 2016; Warnaby et al., 2015).

Scarcity of time and product displayed can thus be marked as the first property of the pop-up shop. It creates a sense of urgency and novelty with potential users. Approached from the perspective of co-design, the effects of scarcity need to be balanced with the comparatively high investment in design, equipment and manpower needed to conceive, build and maintain a successful pop-up space. Rather than months, one day to one week seems affordable.

Both marketing and human geography authors describe the pop-up shop environment as discovery-driven and designed to facilitate consumer engagement. Creating a memorable experience is an important aspect of pop-up activity. While the first studies into the experience economy (Pine & Gilmore, 1999) stressed the involvement of consumers in a theatrical environment, more recent research points to the immersive power of retail spaces engaging active consumers with makers and product experts (Caru & Cova, 2007). Immersion, the experience of entering a multi-sensory space which immediately identifies itself as 'a different world', can be marked as the second important pop-up property.

Warnaby et al. (2015) suggest distinguishing between design, ambient and social cues. Fused with elements such as décor, flooring and furnishing, ambient cues like music, lighting and scent, as well as social cues like positive staff interaction, create emotional and behavioral effects on user engagement (Taube & Warnaby, 2017). Pop-up shops must be multi-sensory and interactive. Scent, sound, sight, taste, touch and movement must be addressed. As immersiveness and interactivity play an important role in engaging the user in an overall theme, this property is particularly important when the pop-shop is predominantly used for the goal of co-design.

Human geography authors also describe pop-ups as in-between spaces existing in the cracks of dominant orders or "residual spaces" (Harris, 2015: 596) left out of time and place. As such they work like an interruption (Ferrerri, 2016) or festival (Ferrerri, 2015) disrupting urban aesthetics and movement routines with unusual locations and exterior shop designs. The visual interruption creates a "surprise effect" (Taube & Warnaby, 2017: 388) and openness for exploration on the side of the user. This property is often referred to as the aesthetic interstitiality of pop-up spaces. Some marketing scholars also stress the event character of pop-up retailing (Pomodoro, 2013; Warnaby et al., 2015). Human geographers refer to this phenomenon as eventual interstitiality (Harris, 2015). Applying aesthetic interstitiality (finding and designing unique spaces) and augmenting eventual interstitiality (using probes or tool kits that engage users into specific activities) designers could use this pop-up shop property to engage users/consumers in co-design.

Finally, the physical pop-up shop integrates digital, social media and mobile (Gursch & Gursch, 2014; Pomodoro, 2013; Alexander and Bain, 2016). Given the need to maximize interest in a pop-up activity over a short period of time, social media assumes great importance in three temporal stages: the pre-experience stage, the pop-up experience itself and the post-experience stage (Warnaby et al., 2015). This applies also for design researchers who want to attract and engage multiple and/or diverse groups of users.

Combining marketing and human geography literature, an operational definition of a pop-up shop as a temporary and highly experiential physical space contains the following properties:

- A limited time frame of one day to one week (playing into scarcity or hype),
- an immersive, multi-sensory and interactive shop environment,
- aesthetic interstitiality (unusual location and/or exterior shop design),
- eventual interstitiality (using design probes and/or tool kits)
- social media co-creation in pre-experience, experience and post-experience phases.

2.2.1 User engagement in the design research framework

How does this operational definition match with existing concepts in co-design research? From a design perspective, pop-up shops are spatial artefacts which are highly experiential. Representing an

integrated experience around a new concept, product or service, they could be categorized as an experience prototype.

... an experience prototype is any kind of representation, in any medium, that is designed to understand, explore or communicate what it might be like to engage with the product, space or system we are designing. (Buchenau & Suti, 2000: 425)

In a pop-up shop, users and stakeholders shape this prototype with their own bodies and senses. They can actively participate and give feedback. This embodied interaction has a number of advantages over purely digital interaction. Stappers (2006) makes a strong argument for bodily involvement of users in the conceptualizing phase of design. With digital tools, logical thought and verbal expression are supported.

What is supported much less well is people's skills in spatial reasoning, associative thought, overview, empathic thinking, informal discussions and serendipity. (Stappers, 2005: 96)

Pop-up shop research allows the immersion of users in an integrated experience which is connected to a temporary physical space, but can also contain digital interaction, virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR). Martinez, Isaacs, Fernandez-Gutierrez, Gilmour & Scott-Brown (2016) describe co-creation, immersion and 'perspective taking' as three distinctive techniques to swap the role between designer and user. Their intention is to serve users. In pop-up shop research, the focus is on engaging users. For this intent, immersion and opportunities to co-design are linked. On the other spectrum of co-design, prototypes are utilised to provoke users (e.g. Boer and Donovan, 2011). Depending on the concept of the particular pop-up shop, pop-up research can be provoking, but this is not the core strength of the approach.

Its strength lies in engagement. Pop-up shops can engage (attract, immerse and motivate to co-design) ordinary users and otherwise difficult to reach communities. They do this by popping up as spatiotemporal in-between (interstitial) spaces in neighbourhoods. Moreover, the near-future orientation of pop-up shops, combined with the effect of scarcity, engages curious user groups like "emergent consumers" and "market mavens" who bring valuable feedback to design (Hoyer, Chandy, Dorotic, Krafft & Singh, 2010: 288). Hoyer et al. (2010) discuss the motivations of users for co-design. Financial or social status benefits play an important role, but so does pure enjoyment. Hedonic motivation and a pleasure to explore and learn are reasons to visit and co-design in a pop-up shop. Pop-up shop research as a special approach in experience prototyping can thus be situated in the 'engaging' slice of the landscape of design research on the layer of the near future (e.g. next five to ten years).

Figure 1. The design research landscape as proposed by Sanders and Stappers (2014, page 13, figure 6).

As embodied interactions, pop-up shop concepts can vary in the degree of co-design with the user. The stars in figure 1 indicate the locations of three iterations of pop-up research conducted. In order to illustrate the theoretical proposition made in this chapter and to further explore opportunities and challenges of pop-up space research, the three iterations and their position in the landscape will be shortly described in the consecutive chapter.

3 Three pop-up shop research examples

In 2016, The Hague University signed the Retail Agenda, a national open innovation network initiated by the Ministry for Economy and representatives from all provinces. Responding to the significant disruption of the retail sector caused by the move to online and changing consumer values and purchasing behaviour, this network of municipalities, highstreets multiples, SMEs, branch intermediaries and real estate stakeholders started working more closely together. In order to engage (parts of) this network into co-creation, the 'Retail Innovation Lab' started a research intervention consisting of an iteration of pop-up shops. They were conceived as experiential engagement platforms around different themes, working together with Industrial Design and Communications students. With a cross-disciplinary learning module of ten weeks, it embedded this project across different curricula. The three following examples concern learning iterations of this pop-up shop research.

3.1 In Bloom: the fuzzy front end

Figure 2 Logo of the pop-up shop.

In early 2016, a Dutch grower's cooperative (twelve flower and plant growers) approached the 'Retail innovation Lab' with the goal of discovering the flower preferences of Millennials. Their aim was to find out why young people do not buy flowers and what their product preferences were. The lab suggested to use a pop-up approach to explore the following research questions:

How far could a flower/plant pop-up experience change students' very perception of these products? And: Which use would students attribute to these products?

Industrial Design Engineering students conceived a stand-alone pop-up shop in the central hall of the University. International Communication Management students came up with a name, 'InBloom', and communication strategy and a Small Business student coordinated the process. The growers provided flowers and plants, but were confined to the role of sponsor. By this their influence on the conception of the pop-up shop was kept minimal.

Figure 3. Co-design inside and opening outside the 'In Bloom' pop-up shop.

The brief provided to students included the pop-up shop properties which were stated earlier in this paper as design requirements. The pop-up was scheduled to be open for five days, from April 4 to April 8, 2016. For research purposes, students collected data with a short questionnaire at the pop-up entrance and again at the exit. They collected 173 valid questionnaires before, 135 directly after, and 36 valid questionnaires three weeks after the pop-up experience. The questions focused on the visitors' perception, imagination and chosen interactive activities. The author of this paper spent at least an hour every day at the pop-up, talking to visitors and keeping a logbook.

The Communication students created a story around the 'In Bloom' pop-up which was strongly communicated through the logo (figure 2), released two weeks before the opening. The design students came up with a construction of two domes connected by a tunnel, crafted using plastic tubes and a foil cover. They also designed an interactive tree which sent out sound upon touch as the centrepiece of the pop-up shop. Furthermore, there were a visual, auditory and olfactory presentations of flowers including a lounge space. Finally they created work stations where users could paint or eat flowers.

One day after the opening, the University's internal magazine published the following:

When you walk into the aluminium igloos on a green carpet, you enter another world. Fresh flowers colour the walls, the smell does take you to a beautiful spring day in nature and the music moves you further: to a distant place with trickling water and chirping birds. And that's all while you're just in the main atrium. (Link, 2016)

During the five days of 'In Bloom', more than 2,000 students, staff and neighbourhood residents visited. Judging from the questionnaires, it was the perceived oddness of the artefact in this place as much as the flower theme which drew their attention. But the interstitiality of the pop-up shop not only attracted them visually, it also triggered their curiosity, which made them take time to visit the space. Their question "What is this?" was not answered conclusively by the facilitators on site, in order to allow for ambiguity. They were just told that it was a research project and that they were free to touch and explore.

The questionnaire data of 50% of the respondents revealed that the pop-up experience had made them aware of the added value flowers and plants could have for their working environment and/or homes. Even three weeks after the pop-up experience, 30% of the visitors still looked differently at flowers and plants. In personal conversations, many stated that they would want to have more flowers and plants in their lives if only they had the space and time to care for them.

On the day following the opening of 'In Bloom' some people came back to have lunch, meet or work in the pop-up shop. They all stressed the opportunity the space provided to decompress. Many

pointed out that it was the full sensory experience that drew them to the space, particularly the scent. Photos and stories were shared by users on Facebook and Instagram. At some point between the third and fourth day of the pop-up shop, user comments aligned on the space as a “restorative flower oasis”. For the flower and plant growers these results were revealing. They realized that millennials strongly connected to their plants, but could not interact with the kind of products presently on offer in shops. It encouraged them to start thinking in a completely different way about offering the experience of flowers and plants to this user group in the future. In terms of co-design, users developed and shared ideas in different ways. They participated in a ‘name the flower’ contest and in flower tastings, shared their thoughts on postcards and communicated experiences and ideas with the two facilitators in the shop. As users were thus actively co-designing a future product/experience, the ‘In Bloom’ pop-up shop is positioned as the star on the upper right side in figure 1.

3.2 *The Donut Factory: communication and commercialization*

Figure 4. Flyer of the pop-up shop.

Once a year, the lab gives retail students the opportunity to pitch an innovative concept for pop-up shop research. The winning concept receives financial support and help with coordination. In early 2017, a group of five Small Business & Retail Management students came up with the idea to create a customizable donut shop. They received a delivery of fresh donuts from a local bakery every morning. The added value of the retail concept was the customization of the product with different toppings and warm ‘glazing’, as well as the fun experience around that customization. The goal of ‘The Donut Factory’ pop-up shop research was to test this innovative retail format in vivo and to communicate it to local retail entrepreneurs.

‘The Donut Factory’ took place for a week in May 2017 using a part of the University’s innovation space which needed to be completely re-designed. Similarly to ‘In Bloom’, students were briefed on the pop-up properties discussed earlier in the paper as design requirements. To adapt research to this type of pop-up shop and its position in the design process, the method was changed.

Questionnaires were dropped in favour of observation based on a conceptual framework (Varshneya, Das & Khare, 2017: 349, figure 8) which connects experiential value to user behaviour, in this case customer satisfaction and willingness to pay. Donuts were actually sold, but users could determine the price they wanted to pay. The researcher visited the pop-up every day for two hours to observe and talk to customers and conducted interviews with all participating students.

Figure 5. Inside 'The Donut Factory' pop-up experience.

The Communications students conceived a 'happiness theme' around the experience of 'The Donut Factory' which was well communicated by the logo on flyers (figure 4) and on the project's Facebook page. Design students made a wheel of fortune for donut customization options as well as a selfie wall with slogans including "Donut is happiness with sprinkles on it" and "Donut ever give up!". According to customer interviews, the selfies were widely shared on social media. Interestingly, interviews also revealed that users connected a 'guilty pleasure theme' with the pop-up experience. Students and lecturers spending time in the pop-up space mentioned that allowing themselves to eat this kind of unhealthy food was both an exception to their diet and an exceptional pleasure.

At the end of the week, 'The Donut Factory' donated more than 3000 euros in profit to a good cause. The user satisfaction and willingness to pay had been very high, proving the experiential value of the pop-up shop. Visiting retailers invited the students to bring their pop-up shop to a local street. The students concluded that their retail concept could be taken to the market. They realized however, that the scarcity effect of the pop-up matched with the co-created 'guilty pleasure theme' and concluded that the concept needed to be rolled out as pop-up retailing (as opposed to a permanent shop).

In terms of co-design, there were no extra activities with probes or toolkits like the ones at 'In Bloom'. Arguably, the co-creation on the usability of this retailing concept and the donut customization done by users counts for a middle position on the 'designing together with users' scale. Also, the retailing concept was almost situated in the here and now. That is why 'The Donut Factory' figures as the star in the middle-downward position in figure 1.

3.3 To-Kiss-Or-Not-To-Kiss: contextual product development

Figure 6. Clay prototypes of the multicultural kissing couple.

In July 2017, the 'Retail Innovation Lab' had the opportunity to be represented at the prestigious Dutch Design Week in Eindhoven with a research pop-up shop. It collaborated with a lecturer from the Industrial Design Engineering who was doing a Master degree about the concept of a Dutch multicultural souvenir. Together with a group of students she had redesigned two typical Dutch souvenirs: The kissing couple and the stroopwafel cookie. Ten prototypes of the new kissing couple were made from clay and the cookie (a student graduate project) had been enhanced with three flavours based on spices from cultures which had most influenced the country. The research question was: How can souvenir design reflect craftsmanship and co-design related to cultural symbols and identifications? And on a different level: How can a themed pop-up shop engage visitors in co-design of the souvenir?

Figure 7. The pop-up store in the hall of Dutch Design Week (left). The selfie booth with co-creating users (right).

Again, Design Engineering and Communications students participated in the project. Briefings included the pop-up requirements which were stated earlier in this paper. They designed and built a pop-up market booth which was accessible from three sides. One side with a display of the different kissing couples which could also be held and touched. One side where the cookie product could be scented and tasted and one side with a 'step in' selfie booth in Delft Blue style. The selfie booth had wall tile designs from six different cultures and played Arabic music inside. The pop-up shop remained open for ten days during Dutch Design Week in October 2017. Short questionnaires of 130 visitors were collected and around 500 users left visual and oral feedback. Furthermore, the researcher spent three entire days at the pop-up to conduct ethnographic observation.

95 % of the questionnaire respondents recommended visiting the design project to friends and colleagues, in spite of its competition with 24 other projects in the same hall. As word-of-mouth is a variable dependent on experiential value (Varshneya, Das & Khare, 2017: 349, figure 8), it can be concluded that this value was high. After six days, the project featured on the news of NOS1, the main Dutch television network. However, right wing media only used the visual of the Moroccan styled couple to initiate a heated discussion about the status of Moroccan culture in The Netherlands (almost 6000 Facebook posts after two weeks). Unintendedly, the artefact had thus become more of a provotype.

Figure 8. Co-design in the pop-up shop: Cookie tasting and marking personal immigration stories on a huge map.

In terms of co-design, there were several probes as shown in figure 8. However, visitors perceived the actual product design as finished. Their input on the development of the design of the products was minimal. Co-design was also hindered as the available space in the fair was smaller than

promised and visitors could not lounge or linger, which had been possible at 'In Bloom' and 'The Donut Factory'. On the conceptual side, in terms of giving meaning to the overall experience, users and stakeholders (embassies, producers, retailers) left a lot of feedback. The pop-up provided the platform for thinking about a future in which nationality would be more like an aesthetic concept than a cultural or ethical one. For this reason, the star of the 'To-Kiss-Or-Not-To-Kiss' pop-up shop research is placed on the left middle-high position in figure 1.

4 Conclusion and discussion

4.1 Requirements of pop-up shop design for research

Pop-up shop research can be seen as a spatial form of experience prototyping enabling embodied interaction of users and other stakeholders with near-future concepts, products or services. Once marketing goals are taken out of the pop-up shop, its properties can be used by designers and researchers for co-design intentions. The pop-up shop is strongest in engaging users, as opposed to provoking or serving them. In theory and practice it could be demonstrated that the following properties are design requirements:

- Scarcity, restriction in terms of time (one day to one week) with the goal to create a sense of urgency,
- immersive, multi-sensory and interactive shop environment with the goal to prototype an integrated bodily experience for the user,
- aesthetic interstitiality (unusual location and/or exterior shop design) with the goal to create curiosity and open-mindedness with users and other stakeholders,
- eventual interstitiality (using design probes and toolkits) with the goal to increase co-design with the user on particular questions,
- social media cocreation in pre-experience, experience and post-experience phases with the goal to communicate the experience with broader groups of users.

Additionally, the first iterations with pop-up shop research indicate that a space to launch and linger inside the pop-up shop seems to be important for co-design intentions.

4.2 Opportunities and challenges of pop-up shop research for co-design

The opportunities of pop-up shop research lie in the engagement of users and stakeholders that would otherwise be more reluctant to co-design. Pop-up shop research can provide a platform for co-design with difficult to reach communities, resonating with stakeholders that are time constrained as well as with broader groups of ordinary users. Often these kinds of users are not motivated to participate by financial or social status benefits. The pop-up shop allows an integrated experience of near-future concepts, products or services and draws on hedonic and epistemic motivation: The fun of exploring and learning something new.

The practice explorations described in this paper show that users in pop-up shops rather search meaningful experiences than memorable (Pine & Gilmore, 1999) ones. Together with facilitators they construct meaning around technologies, products and services. This is why it seems that pop-up shop research is strongest at the 'fuzzy front-end' of the design process (like 'In Bloom'), or in the stage of commercialization and communication (like 'The Donut Factory'). Also open-ended collaborative design exploration (Mattelmaeki, Brandt & Vaajakallio, 2011) seems to be very suited. Further research will need to proof this.

A major challenge of pop-up shop research is its complexity and high demand in resources. Collaborating with student designers and communicators facilitates lower costs, but it would be interesting to see what professional designers and architects could create as a research pop-up shop. Furthermore, students had the opportunity to work in creative teams across disciplines, and acquired skills to design and build a temporary space. However, they lacked facilitation skills. Finding

out which probes and tool kits might be particularly apt to enhance co-design in pop-up shops, drawing on well-developed facilitation skills, is an important path for further research.

The pop-up shop experience prototyping should also be further explored as a process tool for multiple stakeholder co-design in open innovation projects. The pop-up spaces created by the Retail Innovation Lab allowed for companies, intermediaries and public offices to engage in different stages of the design process. However, what happens when pop-up shops are taken to the location of one stakeholder? Or when pop-up shops are (partly) made together by users and stakeholders? There is much more to discover in pop-up shop research to develop co-design opportunities.

5 References

- Alexander, B. & Bain J. K. (2016). Small store design and marketing effects: experiential developments in SME fashion pop-up store strategies. Macintyre, C., Melewar, T.C. & Dennis, C. (Eds.), *Multi-channel marketing, branding and retail design: new challenges and opportunities*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group, pp. 163-192.
- Boer, L., & Donovan, J. (2012). Prototypes for participatory innovation. *Proceedings of the designing interactive systems conference* (pp. 388-397). ACM.
- Buchenu, M., & Suri, J. F. (2000). Experience prototyping. *Proceedings of the 3rd conference on Designing interactive systems: processes, practices, methods, and technique* (pp. 424-433). ACM.
- Carù, A. & Cova, B. (2007). *Consuming experience*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Colomb, C. (2012). Pushing the urban frontier: temporary uses of space, city marketing, and the creative city discourse in 2000s Berlin. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 34 (2), pp. 131–152.
- De Lassus, C. & Freire, N.A. (2014). Access to the luxury brand myth in pop-up shops: A netnographic and semiotic analysis. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 21 (1), pp. 61-68.
- Fairhurst, G.T. & Putnam, L. (2004). Organizations as discursive constructions. *Communication Theory*, 14 (1), pp. 5-26.
- Ferreri, M., 2016. Pop-up shops as interruptions in (post)recessional London. Jordan, S. & Lindner, C. (eds.), *Cities interrupted. Visual cultures and urban space*, London, UK: Bloomsbury, pp. 141-156.
- Finan, S., 2015. Transient Places: The public benefits of short-term artist-led spaces. *Irish Journal of Arts Management & Cultural policy*, 2, pp. 2-11.
- French, T., Teal, G., & Raman, S. (2016). Experience Labs: co-creating health and care innovations using design tools and artefacts. *DRS 2016 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 2965-2979). London, UK: Design Research Society.
- Gursch, F. & Gursch, G. (2014). Die Erfolgsfaktoren von Pop-up-Shops. Ternès, A. & Towers, I. (Eds.), *Internationale Trends in der Markenkommunikation. Was Globalisierung, neue Medien und Nachhaltigkeit erfordern*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer Fachmedien, pp. 15-31.
- Haas, S. & Schmidt, L. (2016). What drives the success of pop-up shops?. *Wissenschaftliche Beiträge*, 20 (1), pp. 89-95.
- Harris, E. (2015). Navigating pop-up geographies: Urban space-times of flexibility, interstitiality and immersion. *Geography Compass*, 9 (11), pp. 592-603.
- Hoyer, W. D., Chandy, R., Dorotic, M., Krafft, M., & Singh, S. S. (2010). Consumer cocreation in new product development. *Journal of service research*, 13 (3), pp. 283-296.
- Kastner, O.L. (2015). *Erfolgsfaktoren von Pop-up Shops. Fallstudiengestützte Evaluation am Beispiel der Bekleidungsindustrie*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer Fachmedien.
- Klein, J.F., Falk, T., Esch, F.-R & Gloukhovtsev, A. (2016). Linking pop-up brand shops to brand experience and word of mouth: The case of luxury retail. *Journal of Business Research*, 69 (12), pp.5761-5767.
- Koskinen, I., Zimmerman, J., Binder, T., Redstrom, J. & Wensveen, S. (2011). *Design research through practice: From the lab, field, and showroom*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Latour, B. (1994). On technical mediation. *Common Knowledge*, 3 (2), pp. 29-64.
- Lindsay, S., Taylor, N., & Olivier, P. (2012). Opportunistic engagement by designing on the street. *CHI'12 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1709-1714). ACM.
- Martinez, S., Isaacs, J., Fernandez-Gutierrez, F., Gilmour, D., & Scott-Brown, K. (2016). Building Bridges Between User and Designer: Co-creation, Immersion and Perspective Taking. *Advances in Design for Inclusion* (pp. 117-129). Basel, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Mattelmäki, T., Brandt, E. & Vaajakallio, K. (2011). On designing open-ended interpretations for collaborative design exploration. *Co-design*, 7 (2), pp. 79-93.

- Maxwell, D., Woods, M. & Prior, S. (2013). The pop-up ethnographer: Roles of the researcher in temporary spaces. *EPIC Proceedings* (pp. 200–215), American Anthropological Association.
- Moore-Cherry, N. (2017). Beyond art in ‘meanwhile spaces’: Temporary parks, urban governance and the co-production of urban space. Murzyn-Kupisz, M. & Działek, J. (Eds), *The Impact of Artists on Contemporary Urban Development in Europe*, GeoJournal Library 123, Basel, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, pp. 207-224.
- Niehm, L.S., Fiore, A.M., Jeong, M. & Kim, H.J. (2006). Pop-up retail’s acceptability as an innovative business strategy and enhancer of the consumer shopping experience. *Journal of Shopping Center Research*, 13 (2), pp. 1-30.
- Overdiek, A. (2016). Fashion designers and their business partners: juggling creativity and commerce. *International Journal of Fashion Studies*, 3 (1), pp. 27-46.
- Overdiek, A. (2017). Fashionable Interventions: The Pop-up Store as Differential Space. *Organizational Aesthetics*, 6 (1), pp. 116-134.
- Overdiek, A.. (2018). Opportunities for slow fashion retail in temporary stores. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 22 (1), forthcoming.
- Pine, B.J. & Gilmore, J.H. (1999). *The experience economy: Work is theater and every business a stage*. Boston, US: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pomodoro, S. (2013). Temporary retailing in fashion system: an explorative study. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 17 (3), pp. 341-352.
- Russo Spena, T., Caridà, A., Colurcio M. & Melia, M. (2012). Shop experience and co-creation: The case of temporary shop. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 40 (1), pp. 21-40.
- Sanders, E.B.N. & Stappers, P.J. (2008). Co-creation and the new landscapes of design. *Co-design: International Journal of CoCreation in Design and the Arts*, 4(1), pp.5-18.
- Sanders, E.B.N. & Stappers, P.J. (2014). Probes, toolkits and prototypes: three approaches to making in co-designing. *Co-design: International Journal of CoCreation in Design and the Arts*, 10 (1), pp.5-14.
- Stappers, P. J. (2006). Creative connections: user, designer, context, and tools. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, 10 (2-3), pp. 95-100.
- Stappers, P., & Giaccardi, E. (2016). Research through design. *The Encyclopedia of Human-Computer Interaction (2nd edition)*, 43, Interaction Design Foundation, Aarhus, Denmark.
- Surchi, M. (2011). The temporary shop: A new marketing tool for fashion brands. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 15 (20), pp. 257-270.
- Taube, J. & Warnaby, G. (2017). How brand interaction in pop-up shops influences consumers’ perceptions of luxury fashion retailers. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 21 (30), pp. 385-399.
- Teal, G., & French, T. (2016). Designed Engagement. *DRS 2016 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 3653-3668). London, UK: Design Research Society.
- Twenge, J. M. & Campbell, S. M. (2012). Who are the Millennials? Empirical evidence for generational differences in work values, attitudes and personality. Ng, E.S., Lyons S.T., Schweitzer, L. (Eds.), *Managing the new workforce: International perspectives on the millennial generation*, Cheltenham, UK: Edgar Elgar, pp. 152-180.
- Varshneya, G., Das, G. & Khare, A. (2017). Experiential value: a review and future research directions. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 35 (3), pp. 339-357.
- Warnaby, G., Kharakhorkina, V., Shi, C. & Corniani, M. (2015). Pop-up retailing: Integrating objectives and activity stereotype., *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, 6 (4), pp. 303-316.

About the Author:

Anja Overdiek is a senior researcher and leads the University’s “Retail Innovation Lab”. She holds a PhD from Freie Universität Berlin. Her special fields are experiential retail and consumer engagement. Currently, she explores the opportunities of future retail spaces for co-design.